

## JUDICIAL INFORMATION SYSTEM COMMITTEE

FEBRUARY 18, 2011  
9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.  
AOC Office, SeaTac, WA

### Minutes

**Members Present:**

Justice Mary Fairhurst, Chair  
Mr. Larry Barker  
Chief Robert Berg  
Ms. Linda Bell  
Mr. Jeff Hall  
Judge James Heller  
Mr. William Holmes  
Mr. Rich Johnson  
Mr. Marc Lampson  
Judge J. Robert Leach  
Mr. Steward Menefee  
Ms. Barb Miner  
Judge Steven Rosen  
Judge Michael Trickey  
Ms. Yolande Williams  
Judge Thomas J. Wynne

**Guests Present:**

Ms. Marti Maxwell  
Ms. Aimee Vance  
Mr. Joe Wheeler

**Staff Present:**

Mr. Kevin Ammons  
Mr. Bill Cogswell  
Ms. Vonnie Diseth  
Ms. Kate Kruller  
Ms. Vicky Marin  
Ms. Pam Payne

**Members Absent:**

Mr. N. F. Jackson

**Call to Order**

Justice Fairhurst called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. and introductions were made.

**Superior Court Management Feasibility Study – Initial High-Level Cost Estimate**

Mr. Joe Wheeler from MTG presented the Superior Court Management Feasibility Study initial high-level cost estimate. The purpose of this initial estimate was to provide AOC with more firm numbers for the Decision Package being submitted to the Legislature. A more refined, final cost estimate will be delivered as part of the final deliverable for the Feasibility Study in June.

The initial cost estimate is based on a set of assumptions that appear to be most appropriate at this early stage in the feasibility analysis. As the feasibility study and the Judicial Information System Committee decision-making process proceeds, these assumptions may be changed. Taken along with the variability of marketplace for court case management systems, this uncertainty suggests that a cost range should be developed.

The first component of the high-level cost estimate is a discussion of the driving assumptions for the analysis. This is followed by summaries of the high and low estimates of project and ongoing program costs. The detailed cost and analysis schedules are provided in APPENDIX A – Project Cost Estimate – High Range and APPENDIX B – Project Cost Estimate – Low Range.

These documents can be found on the JISC meeting documents web page: [February 18 Meeting Materials](#).

**Recommendations for JISC Scheduling of IT Governance Decisions – (from 01/21 meeting)**

Mr. Bill Cogswell presented Recommendations for JISC Scheduling of IT Governance Decisions. We need to look at the best review schedule for the JISC, what the funding allocations are and where the allocations are most appropriate. Looking at the following points as a starting point for making decisions:

- Need to consider size of request and apply criteria to request.
- Requests over \$150,000 require a decision package based on AOC Budget Office Guidance.
- Projects greater than 12 month duration require a decision package due to the greater risk level on long projects.
- Projects which introduce a new service (outside of baseline) require a decision package.

Justice Fairhurst summarized – we are in the midst of projects and we know we have a big project coming before us that will need to be answered yes or no, so we need to think about where we are right now and how we maximize what we can get with the money we have and with the staff we have. Mr. Jeff Hall clarified that what we are really talking about here is, what dollar amount will trigger a separate project request to the legislature. Mr. Hall suggested a vote be taken with the understanding that we can always change the number, but we would put in a decision package before the March 4 meeting, to get this process started, subject to revision in terms of what the dollar amount is.

**Motion:** Judge J. Leach moved: “consistent with our prior conversation we adopt the recommended funding breakdown amending the 150K to 500K and providing for a 2 million dollar maintenance request in this year’s legislative package to be used for discretionary projects as previously discussed. Second: Bob Berg and Stew Menefee. Motion passed unanimously by members present. Marc Lampson and N.F. Jackson were not present for the vote.

Mr. Bill Cogswell closed with the recommendation for the review cycle;

- AOC will review as the requests come in, and process them accordingly.
- Review by the JISC will be done 3 times per year (every other JISC meeting).
- Decision packages would be done on an annual basis within the budget cycle.

**Motion:** Judge Tom Wynne moved “*we adopt the recommended review schedule as presented*”. Second: Judge Jim Heller. Justice Fairhurst asked to add an amendment: *in the event of an emergency request, discretion will be given to the Executive Committee or an emergency meeting by the JISC will be called to make a decision and that we account for legislative mandates that require action.* Motion passed unanimously by members present. Marc Lampson and N.F. Jackson were not present for the vote.

Justice Fairhurst moved on to the JISC Policy on re-prioritization.

**Motion:** Mr. William Holmes moved: *Once a request is underway in a substantial way (charter approved, resources committed, deliverables being work on), the project priority should not be changed and the project work should be halted only under the most extreme circumstances as determined by the JISC. Requests that have been prioritized by the JISC but not started by AOC can be reprioritized as necessary.* Second: Larry Barker. Motion passed unanimously by members present. Marc Lampson and N.F. Jackson were not present for the vote.

Mr. Bill Cogswell presented ITG requests currently received to date, authorized, those awaiting authorization and the hours needed to complete the requests. The slides are part of the January 21 JISC material and can be found at: [January 21 Meeting Materials](#) under tab number 10.

### ITG Requests

Mr. Kevin Ammons presented the following ITG requests to the committee. The decision of said requests were approved and prioritized to move ahead as follows:

Priority	Request #	Title
1	045	Appellate Electronic Filing
2	009	Add Accounting Data to the Data Warehouse
3	041	Remove CLJ Archiving and Purge Certain Records
4	007	SCOMIS Field for CPG
5	026 & 031	Prioritize Restitution Recipients & Combine True Names and Aliases for Time Pay

ITG request #003 – Imaging and Viewing of Court Documents was sent back to AOC for further analysis.

Having no other business the meeting adjourned at 1:45 pm

### Next Meeting

The next regular meeting will be March 4, 2011, at the AOC SeaTac facility; from 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.